Why WOMEN ARE PAID LESS THAN MEN

by Richard Barry

EDITOR'S NOTE.—*The detailed figures of the 1910 federal census will not be available for several months. The 1900 census showed that in the United States there were then 19,647,708 women, of whom 4,833,630 were wage-earners. Of these wage-earners 3,595,663 were over 21 years of age. It has been accepted in the following article as a fair basis of computation that there are approximately 6,000,000 women wage-earners at the present time in this country, and that about a quarter of these, or a million and a quarter, are less than 21 years of age. Also, that of all the women in the country about one-quarter are wage-earners. It is common knowledge that women, with few exceptions, are paid less than men. Why is this so? Will suffrage help them to get more? Or what will help them? In the following article Mr. Barry makes records of the investigations he has been making for* PEARSON'S MAGAZINE *along these lines.*

I CAME to the kitchen of a great hotel. Normally this would be woman's sphere, the cooking of food. But I found hundreds of men at work, men chefs, men assistant chefs, men buyers, men mixers, men tasters, men butchers, men carvers, men waiters, men scullions, men dishwashers; a male army scientifically, economically, expeditiously catering to the sophisticated traveling stomach. Not a woman in sight.

At length, tucked away in one corner by the breakfast grill, I came upon two women. "Hello!" I said to the proprietor, who was showing me proudly around, "how did this happen?"

"Those are the only women in the place," he said. "We have them to toast bread. We cannot find a man who will take the toasting of bread seriously enough. We have a name for excellent toast, and we must keep it up. Men slight the job, though careful with all others. We have found that only women will do it conscientiously enough to please our patrons."

"Toasting bread is a woman's specialty, then?"

"We have found it so?"

"Do you pay them well?"

"Not as much as we used to pay men to do it less satisfactorily than the women do it."

"Why is that?"

"For two reasons," replied the veteran employer of labor. "In the first place, there are plenty of other women anxious to get the job, and quite capable of filling it. While no man seems able to do it, many women are able. These women know that and are glad to get what we do pay them. Secondly, we find that to get the highest efficiency from them we must lay them off for about three days out of every month. If we don't lay them off those three days we are likely to get poor service, and, eventually, they peter out and break down. So it is an established rule now for every woman in our employ to have three days off during the month. We don't take it out of her wages directly, but we count it in establishing the wage."

We were at the height of civilization (so-called). My mind ran back to savagery.

Digitized by Google

There the man killed his game; that was all. The woman brought it home, skinned it, cut it, cooked it, served it. Every service connected with food, except the prime essential of getting it, was hers.

Times surely have changed when, in the preparation of food, woman has become little more than the vermiform appendix.

Then I went among the garment workers on the lower East Side. There I saw women cutting clothes, women sewing, packing, labeling clothes of every description.

"Why do you have women instead of men?" I asked one foreman.

"Because the supply is inexhaustible," he replied. "And no man will work for the wages we pay these women. A man has to live on what he gets; with the woman the pay is frequently but a part of her income."

But uptown, in the first-class tailoring establishments, I found no women cutters, no bushelwomen. "Why?" I asked.

"Because women will not serve out an apprenticeship of years to master the trade," was the answer. "Every woman who goes to work looks on her employment as a temporary makeshift. She cannot be brought to look at her time as a capitalist looks at money, which must be invested for little or no return for a few years in order to get a big return later. She wants all she can earn at once, hoping from month to month and from year to year that she will get married and so do away with the necessity for outside work."

"Do you never find a woman who plans to make a life-work of garment cutting?"

My informant hesitated, then said, with a smile, "We don't want women making high-class tailored clothes. With us every suit is, in a measure, a creation, and women never seem to have the creative gift, so applied."

Following up to the source of fashions, both in men's and in women's clothes, I learned that it is with rare exceptions that women are employed in the leading shops for designing and creating the new gowns, the new hats, the new furs, the new overcoats. Men get large salaries for the designs that lead civilization by its sartorial nose, but the highest places that women ever achieve are those which carry out the designs of men.

Thus it seems that in the clothing industry where skill of an unusual degree is required men are employed; where little or no skill is required you find women. And in cooking, where executive efficiency is required, you find men; where no particular standard of efficiency prevails, as in the countless homes of the country, you find women.

In other words, where quality of work is demanded you find men; where quantity is needed you find women. It is an axiom of prices that quality is paid more than quantity.

The Bar of Sex

THE majority of the stock of the Pennsylvania Railroad is said to be owned by women, yet there is not a woman in any executive position on the road. Stock in nearly all of the railroads is held by women, yet, except as stenographers, women are seldom employed in railroading. I asked a railroad official why he had so few women in his office.

"I like women stenographers and clerks," he said. "But I cannot employ as many as I wish because they are not eligible for higher positions. I like to feel that every person who enters the employ of this road has a chance some day to be the president."

A young western woman described what she declared to be "the most humiliating moment of my life." She had applied for the position of secretary to the vice-president of one of the large railroads. She was an expert typist and an accurate stenographer and was, besides, a college graduate with excellent recommendations.

"Have you any idea of the duties involved?" asked the vice-president.

As she had been the private secretary to the president of a large western college and in that capacity had accompanied him on lecture tours, taking charge of his correspondence and other work, she replied, "Yes."

"Among other things," he said, regardless of her assurance, "you must be constantly with me, spending practically all your time on the road. You must attend to my correspondence whenever it suits me best, even if that time should happen to be at 4 A.M. My work is with the freight end of the business, and you must be prepared to investigate matters thoroughly as my representative, dealing with minor agents throughout the country. You must not be afraid of being talked about, if you travel with me alone in my private car, or if you are compelled to work late at night or stay at the same hotel with me, taking dictation in my room."

The girl gasped at this, but he continued, as she described it, "mercilessly," "Does

Digitized by Google

this sort of a position appeal to you? You are young and I think clever. The letters show you are a skilled stenographer, and I know that you would become valuable to me; but I can hold out no such offer of advancement as went to my last secretary, for he was a man."

She found a position elsewhere.

In August of 1910 the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad, finding itself overwhelmed with applications for positions from young women, issued the following statement:

"The Baltimore and Ohio Railroad is an adherent of the civil service policy of promoting those within its ranks to official positions when vacancies occur, and is obliged, therefore, to employ men to every possible position, including particularly stenographic positions, as these afford the best opportunities for beginners to learn the details of railroad work. It is safe to say that nearly all the officials of the system have risen from clerical positions, from messenger boys to stenographers and up, having devoted their entire lives to a study of the business. The railroad, therefore, naturally seeks the services of competent young men, eligible for advancement, in preference to young women."

The steamship companies, also, have similar reasons for discriminating against the employment of women in their offices. A man, if necessity arises, can be pressed into service on the docks; he can meet incoming boats at an early hour in the morning; he can wait for hours on the pier; if need be he can become the freight agent, supervising unruly men; he can endure all sorts of hardship to which women are unaccustomed.

In many other employments a woman's sex is against her. Large coal companies prefer to promote their stenographers and clerks to positions in charge of districts in the mining country. As a part of the duties of such a position is often to keep order among the employees, a woman could not fill it. Hence women are not welcome in the beginner positions which, were it not for this chance of advancement, they might fill as well as men.

Saleswomen vs. Salesmen

MANY women are employed by the telegraph companies, but they are not as desirable as men. A woman could not be placed in charge of a station where the telegrapher must be baggage man, ticket agent, guardian of the safe and bouncer of objectionable persons—all at once.

A few weeks ago one of the great ocean liners tried what it considered to be a hazardous experiment. A young woman was sent on a transatlantic voyage as wireless operator. Part of her duties will be to repair her apparatus in all sorts of wind and storm. How she will measure up to those requirements remains to be seen. Before that there was only one woman employee of the Wireless Company, and she was in charge of the station on the roof of the Waldorf-Astoria, where she could call for male help easily. It has been said that neither of these women were paid as much as men at similar employments.

A few years ago some women were appointed customs inspectors, after severe discussion, and under protest. But when they found they would be obliged to board ocean liners from a small launch by way of a rope ladder that swung with every motion of the ship they were relieved at their own request.

On the other hand, telephone operators are almost always women. They are chosen for the same reason that the hotels want their bread-toasters women, because of enduring patience. Also, the supply of women workers is vast; therefore the wages are low.

The largest wholesale drygoods house in America does not employ women except in very subordinate positions. A member of the firm said: "The duties in a wholesale house are very strenuous while they last; the season is long and the days are busy. Even if a woman were able to lift down heavy pieces of goods, to spend ten hours a day constantly on her feet, to take customers around the town until the wee sma' hours, there are other reasons to prevent her success. Women are not as capable sellers as men, and the majority of buyers. regardless of sex, prefer to deal with a man, Ask a woman buyer who comes to town for her supplies and the answer is invariably, 'I do not care to buy goods from a woman.'"

In the retail houses it is different. There most of the salespeople are women, though with few exceptions the executive heads are men. Yet even there the matter of physical endurance is a vital one. One afternoon in a New York retail store I heard a loud shriek. All the shoppers looked up in alarm; the saleswomen paid no attention to the outcry.

"What is that accident?" I asked the floorwalker.

"An everyday occurrence," he answered. "One of the salesgirls has gone nutty temporarily—female nerves, hysteria, too long on her feet at the wrong time of the month. We have a hospital on the third floor to care for them."

Digitized by Google

In higher walks of effort there is the other side of this sex differentiation. Henry Clews, the veteran banker, in his "Fifty Years in Wall Street," devotes a chapter to it, in which he bitterly arraigns several women who have attempted success in the financial district. These were women who used their sex blandishments to facilitate business deals.

Often have I heard business and professional women complain, saying, "Men will not treat us as units; they either insult us because of sex, or patronize us because of it." This is the "sex antagonism" of which so much is said in discussions of suffrage. The cause is not confined to either sex. Gross men and unscrupulous women have combined to make it.

Result: high-minded men almost invariably prefer not to deal with women, where the dealing is one of equals. They do not care to take the chance of the obtrusion of any sex problem. Successful men worship efficiency, and they have found that efficiency is lessened when any suggestion of sex enters into the problem.

Two Feminine Professions

THERE are two professions in which women are paid as much as men—acting and nursing. These are distinctly feminine employments. In neither is it so necessary to think as it is to feel. Both require the feminine personality, one for its allurement, the other for its sympathy.

The profession of trained nurse is overcrowded in this country, which is somewhat surprising, for the novitiate is long and hard, the pay almost never exceeds a given rate of $25 a week and board, and the life is so strenuous that the average duration of a nurse's career is seven years.

I asked a trained nurse why she chose that employment rather than teaching, for instance, and she replied: "When I was a girl I never had the chance to associate with people of refinement and I figured that if I could become a trained nurse I would get the chance to enter fine homes, to know nice people, and so, if only in a professional way, get some of the pleasure and culture which I had always craved." She hesitated, blushed, and added: "Besides, a nurse constantly has the chance to show the best side of her nature, and within the past year four of the girls I know at the hospital have married men they met in the sickroom."

So there it is again! Women's universal goal—marriage. Even in a strictly woman's profession, where men have scant chance, the work is but a means to an end, the employment temporary.

The chorus girl gets as much as the chorus man. She ought to have more, for who cares anything about the chorus man? It is the chorus girl that draws people to the musical shows. Again, the reason her pay is no more is that the supply of her is seemingly inexhaustible. Besides, she is not dependable; she may be on hand for a performance; she may not be.

There are more women stars in this country than there are men star actors. Some of them have a larger income than any man on the stage. This fact ought to be sufficient answer to the suffragists' claim that the ballot has anything to do with income. The women stars are paid more because their drawing power at the box-office is more. That drawing power is more because the theater-going public would rather see a great actress than see a great actor. And where the choice is between the fairly good actor and the fairly good actress, the actress draws the people every time.

On the stage one never hears complaint that men get more money than women. The situation there is sufficient to please any co-economist. Very few persons on the stage know how to think. In fact, few of them know how to feel, though they all make some sort of bluff at it. Education is unnecessary; general association with humanity is tabooed, and few of the profession read enough to have any grasp on things of the mind. So the matter of sex never enters into the question of pay, except it be to favor the woman.

The School Teacher

THERE is another profession often considered to be strictly woman's sphere—school teaching. But the general rule that obtains throughout the country is that women are employed chiefly in the lower grades and in subordinate positions, while men are preferred in the executive positions and in the colleges. There are notable exceptions to this rule, such as Mrs. Ella Young of Chicago; but the rule holds to-day as it has for a century past.

For three years past the women school teachers of New York have been strenuously agitating the demand for pay that shall equal the pay of men teachers. They have a strong association, a clever leader, and they have been able to get much attention for their claims from the metropolitan

Digitized by Google

press. Finally Mayor Gaynor appointed a commission to investigate the question of equal pay among men and women teachers. The commission turned in a recommendation, of which the gist was, "equal pay for equal work."

But, under the city charter, the Board of Education alone has power to establish salaries. So the board turned the matter over to its committee on by-laws and legislation, which considered the report of the Mayor's commission. Early last December a final report was made to the Board of Education. In brief, this report was:

"Women school teachers are far less efficient than men teachers and are consequently not entitled to equal pay."

This report remains the working standard of the most important Board of Education in the country. There were a few recommendations for changes in salary schedules, and in establishing these the committee laid down the following rule, which it is fair to say is the unexpressed law of teachers' pay throughout the country:

"The salary must follow the position and not the sex."

In other words, where, by some freak of nature, a woman is capable of filling a position as well as a man she is to receive the same pay, but there is never to be any discrimination in her favor merely because she is a woman.

Thus the economic law is as merciless and unchivalric as the moral law. Any violation of this law is bound to end in economic disaster. The decision of the New York Board of Education was highly disappointing to the majority of women school teachers in the metropolis, and their agitation for equal pay, regardless of service, continues and doubtless will continue.

Teaching is a better employment for women than any other, chiefly because of the easy hours, six hours a day, five days a week, nine months a year. This gives a woman the chance for physical recuperation which is denied her in almost every other class of work. One of the results of this advantage is shown by the statistical fact that a smaller percentage of women teachers marry than that of any profession employing women.

Of the six million women in the country who are earning wages about a quarter are less than twenty years of age. A third of them marry and retire from wage earning before they are twenty-seven, and a quarter of the whole number—about 1,250,000—over the age of twenty-one are employed as domestics. So there are really only about three million adult wage-earners in the country, outside of domestic service.

The Business Woman

OF the adult working women more and more are each year entering business life, and there are many conspicuous successes among them. But if you trace the history of these successes you will find almost invariably that the woman promoter, the woman operator in any branch of business, has some close association with some man, and is privileged to avail herself of his masculine judgment in determining values and in manipulating the market.

Recently there came into wide public view a woman real-estate operator who had seemingly accomplished the impossible. By skilful manipulation she had amassed a fortune in about two years, and all apparently through her own efforts.

At the same time there appeared another woman real-estate operator, unsuccessful, who attempted suicide, leaving a pathetic note explaining her inability to get along in the world. The editor of one of the largest newspapers in the country, one which publishes daily, "Hints to the Business Woman," sent a reporter to interview the successful woman on the subject of the unsuccessful one.

The reporter returned empty-handed, and explained to his editor, "She would see no one, but I learned what has happened. She has intrusted all her savings to the man who was silently in partnership with her, and he has disappeared, nor does it seem likely that he will return."

The paper, being devoted to "the interests of women," never printed the story and it has never been written until now.

Fortunately not all men silently associated with successful women are scamps, and so we here and there see women with meteoric triumphs to their credit. In business, as a rule, women are more audacious than men; they seem to possess a courage that most men lack; a gambling spirit will rule them more intensely. This results from their immunity, both actual and inherited, from the pitfalls of business experience. A man learns sadly through many years how difficult success really is; he grows cautious, almost afraid. To the brilliant, ambitious woman he appears timid. She, perhaps well along in life, but inexperienced in the gruelling disillusionment of worldly effort,

Digitized by Google

comes freshly to a business venture with a soul-quality that is only matched in buoyant daring youth. Then, if steadied by the calm judgment of an experienced man, she sometimes achieves a meteoric success, one which he alone would be too timid to achieve, and which she alone would be too impractical to carry out.

Thus we seem to see woman triumphant in a new and unaccustomed sphere, while in reality the phenomenon is but a change of position in team-work. For the normal man always has beside him, encouraging, inspiring him, buoying him up with a faith and hope which are hardly practical, some devoted woman who is content in the old-fashioned and womanly way to share his successes quietly.

Will Suffrage Help?

FEMALE suffragists claim that if women vote they will be able to better their economic condition. Let us see, first from common sense, then from specific instance.

Labor cannot, any more than paper, be coined into money by the fiat of a government or an organization. Conditions mentioned above are bound to regulate women's wages, just as other conditions rule men's wages. Millions of men are not paid what they deserve, and they have not yet solved the problem of legally raising their wages. Is it possible to suppose that women, so much less experienced in the ways of politics, will find a remedy that men have not found? Is it not more likely that their votes will be even more futile than men's now are?

At the present time the thoughtless voter swings elections. A large number of the most intelligent and best qualified men pay little attention to politics. Result? The unintelligent now holds the power in politics.

If women vote the same condition will persist, but much intensified. The unintelligent, and the worst class of women will visit the polls persistently, while the better class of women, like the better class of men, will ignore politics. This has already been proven to be the case where women now vote.

Then, giving women votes will not change conditions. It will simply make more distant the day when intelligent voting will rule political affairs.

Suffrage writers and speakers are inclined to place a halo on the brow of female industrial labor. This is one of the gravest evils of the suffrage agitation. Instead of exalting the woman laborer, the necessity for her industrial existence should be deplored. It is not a sign of progress that we have six million wage-earning women in this country; it is a sign of retrogression. If we gain two million more wage-earning women in the next decade, it will not be a sign of advance; it will rather be a certain indication that the nation is slipping toward decay.

A year ago, when I started out for this Magazine to report the woman suffrage agitation, I had no convictions on the subject. In interviewing the leaders, however, I was astonished to discover that they had no definite plan to offer for bettering the condition of working women.

The plea was wholly "Votes for Women"; never "Better conditions for women." It was largely this specious pleading that convinced me that the women suffrage leaders were either insincere or ignorant. Where they displayed any knowledge of political conditions they evaded facts. Most of them showed no knowledge whatever of the "rights" for which they were hysterically pleading.

Thus I concluded that the suffrage leaders were not true to the great mass of women, and especially to working women. The ignorant were blind leaders of the blind. The intelligent were worse; they were evilly blinded leaders of the blind.

They (these suffrage leaders) want to place a further burden on the back of female labor. They offer no solution of a woman's problems; they but complicate her difficulties. Instead of raising the present cruel tyranny, they seek to increase it.

They would add to politics the only corruption it now lacks—sex corruption. They would so confuse the minds of women workers that the day of their deliverance from their present difficulties would be indefinitely postponed.

Worst of all, they would take from men their dearest possession—a reverence for women. When men cease to reverence women they will cease to reverence anything. In fact, woman suffrage is one of the stigmata of degeneracy.

However, if there are six million women in this country earning their own bread, their rights demand a most serious consideration from voting men. If we can mitigate their unfortunate lot by any legislation, it is distinctly men's duty to discover that legislation and to pass it, and to enforce it without delay.

Digitized by Google

Let us consider a few concrete instances of what the ballot cannot do for women.

In Colorado women have had the suffrage for seventeen years. Before the women there got the ballot, men school teachers were receiving from 10 per cent. to 35 per cent. more pay than women teachers. To-day, after seventeen years of women's voting, the pay for school teachers in Colorado bears the same ratio between the sexes that it did in 1894. Voting has made no difference in it whatever.

In California, on the other hand, where women do not vote and where a woman suffrage amendment to the constitution has been three times defeated, a large percentage of women school teachers are paid the same as the men, and none of them fall as far below the masculine standard of pay as 35 per cent.

In Wisconsin and Massachusetts women have school suffrage. If the suffragists' contention were true one would find in these States that men and women teachers were on a par as regards pay. Not at all. The condition is similar to that in Colorado; the same as it is in New York City.

Last summer I traveled extensively through the four western States which have woman suffrage. I looked in vain for an equality in pay between men and women. I found girl stenographers getting less than men stenographers. I found women clerks getting less than men clerks. I found women doctors and lawyers getting smaller fees than men lawyers and doctors. I found women reporters getting less than men reporters. Voting, through periods varying from fourteen to forty-one years, had not made the slightest difference.

In all the many years during which men have been voting they have striven, ineffectively, to keep wages up. In many cases the working man's vote has been but one more factor in the unscrupulous employer's power over the employee, and the enforced vote of labor kept oppression in power.

Men have found that it is not by votes that they can raise their wages. They have discovered that it is only by organization and coöperation that they can hope to force employers to some recognition of their rights. Women are only beginning to learn the value of labor unions. When they do master the union problem they will do a thousand times more toward raising their wages than they ever will be able to do if they have the ballot.

The Working Woman's Advantage

UNDER purely man-made laws the working woman has many advantages that working men cannot claim. It is not likely that she could improve on them, and whatever improvement is to be made will be done by male voters and male legislators. In this the past ought to be a guaranty of the future.

A married woman, for instance, has far freer control over her own property than a married man has over his. Her earnings, if she is a wage-worker, are absolutely and solely her own, and she is under no obligation to provide for her husband as he is to provide for her, even to the extent of paying her alimony if she gets a divorce and remarries.

A man in business may be arrested for debt fraudulently contracted. Under the law you cannot so arrest a woman. A woman against whom a judgment for debt is obtained enjoys certain exemptions from execution that a man does not enjoy except when he has a family to provide for.

Besides these there are many statutes expressly designed to favor working women. One of the best, in New York, provides that a man may be imprisoned without privilege of bail, and that none of his property is exempt from execution, if he fails to pay the wages of a female employee up to fifty dollars.

Conclusion

IT is man's duty to protect woman, if for no other reason, because she is physically the weaker. He has not been able to protect her entirely from the necessity to compete with him in wage-earning employments. Therefore he should make her position there as advantageous as possible.

If the ballot could help her to better wages that alone might be a sufficient reason for extending the franchise to her. But, instead of helping her, it will only give her new responsibilities which she is not able to meet on top of the present responsibilities which she has not yet learned to master.

Suffragists vainly and fondly imagine that the noble simplicity of casting a ballot will make a change in woman's condition. In spite of the baseness to which their political methods have sometimes descended, they misconceive the nature of politics.

Politics is war. Success in politics requires the brain of a Roosevelt or a Machia-

Digitized by Google

velli, the instinct of a gambler, and the physique of a man. None except an abnormal woman could possibly prosper in political life.

Being a warlike pursuit, politics draws to its standards in America, a non-military country, all men of military instincts. And, like all true fighting men, of all ages and places, the politicians of this country have a regard, first and above all, for their women and children.

There is no surer way of having a law passed in any state in the Union than to prove conclusively that it will benefit women and children. That is an irresistible appeal, one often abused, frequently so tattered and worn that it disgusts the hearer, and yet always potent.

So, whenever and wherever women wage-earners can show male legislators that any particular legislation will improve their conditions, the chances are almost certain that that legislation will appear on the statute books.

But there is a limit to what legislation can do.

It is utterly impossible for legislation to accomplish any of the following reforms:—

1. Change the physical nature of women so that every day of the month will find them in equal fitness for work.

2. Eliminate the maternal instinct from women so that they will cease to care for children; or, in the absence of children, to care for some substitute, worthy or unworthy. This maternal instinct, one purely of unselfish love, is in direct conflict with the soldier instinct, lacking which no man is a success either in business or in politics.

3. Remove the domestic instinct from women so that they will care more for shops, factories, offices and the street than they do for homes. Until, as a class, they care more for outside work than they do for homes, they will never have the earning power that men possess. As you love your work, so shall it reward you.

These, then, are the three great changes that must come about in women before they will earn as much money as men earn:

They must get greater physical strength.

They must stifle and destroy those primitive instincts of yearning and unreasonable love which prevent them from utter concentration on the practical problems of the working life.

They must somehow overcome those soft tastes which have been able to cast an allurement over the dwelling-place, so that the great majority of men consider home, however humble it may be, more to be desired than any wealth or any honor.

When these three revolutions in woman's nature are accomplished women will be able to earn just as much money as men earn.

Perhaps more. For then the principal reason for a man to earn money will be removed; he will no longer have a woman to whom to give it.

[Men who dig coal most urgently need legislation for their own good. Yet the right to vote has not helped them one bit. Look at this. Last October an explosion in the Starkville coal mine killed fifty-five men. The mine's last annual report before the disaster showed that it had cleared 500,000 dollars in the previous year. The mine needed a new airshaft to make it fairly safe; the mine was so dusty that an explosion was not improbable. But a new airshaft would cost 10,000 dollars, one-fiftieth of one year's net earnings. That was too much; it would reduce by a fraction of a cent the profit per ton of coal. Colorado had no law to make the company sink the shaft, so fifty-five men died. Neither men's nor women's votes (for women vote in Colorado) had helped them. But the time has come when something must be done about mining accidents in this country. Twelve out of every one thousand miners are killed every year. In Belgium, where mining is more dangerous, but where the industry is properly regulated, less than one man out of each thousand is annually killed. An article in this Magazine next month will show that the greater part of mining accidents in this country is due to carelessness and greed; that mine owners sacrifice coal workers for profit to themselves; that mine owners control the government of mining sections; that some wealthy men in their hurdle after a little more money have made human life the cheapest thing in mining sections; that it is time for this Government "for the people" to take a hand. It will be a very clear exposition of the cause of ever-increasing accidents in coal mines.

Digitized by Google